NORTHLAND PRESS,
101A, POULTON ROAD,
WALLASEY, CHESHIRE.

CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

*To serve as a link between Britons all over the world in protest against the surrender of their world heritage*

**Vol. XVII, No. 445** *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.* **September, 1965**

# NOT THAT WAY, RHODESIANS!

## By A. K. CHESTERTON

*Should Rhodesia's decisive step, described by her Prime Minister as imminent, be taken when this issue is in the press, we shall discuss the decision in our October number. Although that decision may outdate the article which follows, it cannot with submission invalidate our argument.*

WHEN Mr. Ian Smith announced that Rhodesia, either by negotiation or by unilateral declaration, would obtain her independence outside the Commonwealth, a shudder must have shaken loyalists in every part of the British world, followed by a feeling of utter bewilderment when it was learnt that the announcement had been vociferously applauded by the Rhodesian Front congress at which he had made it.

No more than a few moments, of course, were needed to see the matter in perspective. To Rhodesians, as to the members of every European community in Africa, the once mighty Commonwealth is today no more than a forum from which subversive pseudo-sophisticates, but a short time ago dwellers in mud-huts, and now the recipients of American degrees, mostly phoney, inveigh against civilized White rule and subject to brat-like insults a man of the dignity and worth of Dr. Verwoerd.

No wonder Mr. Smith made it clear that he did not propose to act as an Aunt Sally for these fever-brained little despots or their lackeys.

### UNFORTUNATE CHOICE

Even so, it is most unfortunate that he chose a form of words which suggested that Rhodesia will cut the painter and renounce her British destiny. It will be even more unfortunate if that is what he really intends. As Mr. Evan Campbell, former High Commissioner in London, pointed out, although Great Britain infuriated Rhodesians, outside South Africa she remains their best friend. Given that resurgence of the British spirit which must surely come, she would reveal herself as something more—as an active champion warning off any meddlers who might seek to molest them.

If members of the Rhodesian Front are sceptical about the possibility of any such national revival they might with profit cast their minds back to the time, not so long ago, when Rhodesians were happy to accept the leadership of Mr. Garfield Todd and, more recently, that of Sir Edgar Whitehead. They cannot argue convincingly that the transition from extreme liberalism, through middle of the road liberalism, to Rhodesian Front conservatism represents anything other than a tremendous resurgence in mind and spirit, and if such a thing can happen in Rhodesia it can happen elsewhere.

What is to be gained by declaring Rhodesia to be, in relation to Britain, a foreign country? That she has to become independent of Whitehall and Westminster is not in dispute, but if the process is to involve alienation from the Crown, then good sense demands that the onus of rejecting allegiance should be placed on the Crown. It may be unrealistic to suppose in such a case that a one-way loyalty could be indefinitely maintained, but it could conceivably be maintained long enough to bring the entire British world to its senses. Nor would such maintenance necessarily be required. The Sovereign might find the spurning of the allegiance of loyal subjects too invidious a task to wish to undertake. There would be nothing to lose, and everything to gain, by putting the matter to the test.

Nor need the Commonwealth bogy obtrude. After Mr. Costello proclaimed the secession of his country from the Commonwealth, the Republic of Ireland retained the advantage of Imperial Preferences and other benefits which association with Britain had conferred on her. Is there any reason why one of Her Majesty's independent domains—the Kingdom of Rhodesia, let us say—should not reaffirm allegiance to the Crown while opting out of the shabby menagerie known as the Commonwealth?

### MORE THAN SENTIMENT

Some say that this is mere sentiment. There is nothing wrong with sentiment, perhaps the most powerful factor in the human psyche, but my argument drives far beyond it to make some provision for the future, not only of Rhodesians, but also of other Europeans in their own homelands and in the far places of the earth. People who cannot see that Europeans everywhere are under attack, both as national entities and as members of the White race, belong to the political kindergarten.

It happens that the enemies of White rule in Rhodesia —and I am not referring to dusky demagogues—are also the enemies of the British world system which they have been smashing apart ever since the First World War, and nothing would delight them more than that the Rhodesians should cut their last spiritual bonds with Great Britain, thereby killing two birds with one stone.

"We can go it alone", I have more than once been told in Salisbury. Such a boast would be a large one, even if made by Great Britain. Nothing could be more abundantly clear, nothing could be more readily demonstrable, than that United States administrations, what-

ever their labels, have made of America a power-instrument with which to bedevil the world, so that all the British nations, together with a natural ally such as South Africa, have the strongest possible interest in creating their own power-bloc to resist attempts to destroy their national sovereignty. This interest is not served, for the simple if damnable reason that international finance has made captive most of the leaders, seeking to involve them in networks of its own devising —for instance, the European Common Market—and a natural alliance based on historical foundations is thereby prevented from taking shape. There is no alliance, natural or otherwise, in the pantomime of a sinister body called the Commonwealth, which is itself an instrument used for our destruction.

The danger confronting us all is a very real one. We live today in a hostile world. I do not think that any man or woman with even a slight knowledge of the forces at work will be disposed to contradict this view of our situation. We need to close our ranks. Yet when Mr. John Gaunt recently arrived in Pretoria as Rhodesian High Commissioner the most constructive act within his mental range was to order the hauling down of the Union Jack from the building where he was to work.

Lucky Mr. Gaunt to sense so little the perils of our time that he can afford to estrange Rhodesia's friends and kick into the gutter the bonds of kinship and a shared history! We can only hope that in Salisbury there are maturer minds to perceive the necessity of helping to re-light that flame of the British spirit which could enable us indeed to go it alone, and enable our friends and allies to go it alone, by re-establishing a shared vision of the values of Christendom, of the common aims and duties imposed by Western civilisation and of the special responsibility that must lie with the White race once it has emerged from the liberal slime in which for the most part it now wallows.

The challenge is to the greatness of men, not to their petulance.

# CUT AND THRUST

ENTHUSIASTS for the "great Commonwealth family" are fond of calling it a unique institution. How right they are! As the rival bombers fly across the frontiers on the way to blast Karachi or Delhi the drone of their engines bespeaks the blessedness of family understanding and brotherly love. The tanks pushing towards Lahore or Amritsar fire their salvoes in salute to the Head of the Commonwealth. And to perfect the picture, the noble Mr. Bottomley abandons his holiday, rushes back to London, poses for the television cameras and goes into conference with that great Viet-Nam peace expert Mr. Harold Wilson. What more superb demonstration of Commonwealth solidarity could there be?

Just one thing, perhaps. Would it not be fitting were the last Viceroy to change his title from Earl Mountbatten of Burma to Earl Mountbatten of India *and* Pakistan?

* * *

The criticism by the German Vice-Chancellor, following that by former Chancellor Adenauer, of Britain's decision to re-equip some Rhine Army units with conventional weapons as its Corporal missiles became obsolescent, shows that Bonn has a real fear that ultimately their Western Allies will sell the pass to the Soviet Union. Nor is this fear altogether groundless. Harold Wilson's defence policy, as expounded in the General Election, and to which he has since adhered, can be best expressed in the formula: "All nuclear power to the United States". And, as Madam Nhu had all too good occasion to remark: "Whoever has the United States for a friend has no need of enemies"—a devastating criticism, not of the American people but of those who inspire their policies.

There seems very little doubt that the Wilsonian move to replace Britain's nuclear missiles with conventional weapons is all part of the drive to secure the centralization—in other words the monopoly—of nuclear power. Although Bernard Baruch be dead, his spirit goes marching on. And if Baruchistan was ever hostile to the Soviet Union I have never seen evidence of that hostility. Yes, the Western Germans have sound enough cause for their mistrust.

* * *

In this connection one can do worse than examine Britain's defence policy in the light of a statement made a week or two ago at the Geneva disarmament conference by General Burns, the Canadian delegate. Said the General: "There is a need to consider the security interests of the Soviet Union regarding the proposed Multiracial Force". That was a most curious remark and tantalizingly the speaker seems to have made no effort to amplify it. What could he have meant? I should have thought that the whole idea of an internationalist contrivance such as the Multiracial Force was a free gift to the security interests of the Soviet Union, but that could not have been what General Burns had in mind.

Of all the ambiguous establishments in the post-war world, none has been more ambiguous than the Canadian Government, from its opposition to Ernest Bevin's Palestine policy, through the British humiliation at Suez, down to the present time. We should understand it better if somebody were to present us with a frank biography of Premier Lester Pearson—an unlikely event. In the meantime Bonn does well to enquire of Ottawa just what the devil Burns was talking about.

* * *

A possible pointer to what General Burns and his Government have in mind is the official statement in London that the Royal Navy's Polaris missile submarine will be manned by British sailors. This is a decision *Candour* must applaud, even though it seems to have been reached, not to maintain intact a superb British service, but because a mixed-man fleet would be likely to strengthen Russian fears about giving Germany "a

finger on the nuclear trigger". The fears are as ludicrous as is the British Government's pandering to them. The very thought of a number of fingers on the trigger is an absurdity.

What is truly mysterious is the veering of Harold Wilson with the veering of the wind. At first he was against mixed man crews. Then, after a visit cap-in-hand to the United States, he returned to become the chief proponent of the idea. Now he is back where he started. The only rational explanation is that Big Brother in New York, who pushed the mixed-man project with all his might as part of the campaign against national sovereignty, has returned to his obsessive thinking about the alleged menace of Germany, and Harold Wilson at once dances to a different tune. It is all a little reminiscent of an earlier Wilson, whose famous Fourteen Points contained a perfervid advocacy of the Soviet Union's cause. However, if Master Harold likes to pretend that Germany and not Russia is the enemy, and on that account saves the Royal Navy from becoming part of a cosmopolitan sea-going circus, we have no reason to complain on that score. May all his delusions contribute their quota to Great Britain's national interest!

* * *

Mr. Bottomley, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, returning from a tour of West Africa, had this to say. "Everywhere I went British businessmen and industrialists—Nigerians, Ghanaians, Gambians—all want British cars and cannot get them. I saw French cars, German cars, but very few British. They told me in West Africa that they wanted cars better sprung and a few adjustments to suit their roads, but they said British manufacturers did not worry about them". Mr. Bottomley said he would mention the matter to the Board of Trade. It will indeed be remarkable if this proves to be the first information the Board of Trade has received about the "take it or leave it" attitude of British manufacturers. I have heard the same complaint in many parts of the African continent over the last several years.

The denials of Mr. Bottomley's statement by the manufacturers made curious reading. So did that of Sir Patrick Hennessy, president of the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders. Said Sir Patrick: "The motor industry is the biggest exporter in the country and you can get English cars in every country of the world". Can so very many people overseas be suffering from a delusion? Sir Patrick then made nonsense of the statement by adding: "We would welcome information which is specific rather than general about where they cannot get our cars. We are anxious to sell to all these places". If there are no such places, why inquire about them? What is more, why should the Society welcome information which it should be the job of its own industrial intelligence service to supply? There would seem to be some very confused thinking in the motor industry.

* * *

Britain's Lord Chancellor, Lord Gardiner, suggested to the Commonwealth Conference in Sydney that a Commonwealth Court of Appeal should replace the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Britain's place in it, he said, would be on the same footing as that of any other member. The suggestion was received with fervent approval, so fervent an approval that the full impact of the idea came crashing down upon the mind. One had an instant image of the motley composition of the Commonwealth Court of Appeal.

I do not mean that there are no judges in the Commonwealth, whatever their race or colour, who are nothing other than honourable and competent men. It seems unlikely, however, that honour and competence will be the qualities sought by the various Governments in selecting judges. What is more, one must remember that English Common Law is the growth of many centuries, whereas to many who will sit on the Commonwealth Court, perhaps to the majority, it will be a recent importation, replacing the casting of bones by the witchdoctor. Standards must inevitably decline. Lord Gardiner surely knows this perfectly well. Does he believe that multiracialism represents a value higher than that of British justice?

* * *

Paul Johnson, writing in the *New Statesman*, declares that the Australian Labour Party's failure to heal the breach with the Catholic Democratic Labour Party alone keeps Labour out of power. That may have been true in the past, but will it be true in the future? Should the answer be "yes" then the dry-rot in Australia has gone even deeper than one feared. Whether or not the breach between the two branches of the Labour movement be healed one would have thought that the Labour Party's decision to overthrow its traditional White Australia policy would have been enough to keep it out of power in perpetuity. I am aware, of course, that many newspapers, many Church leaders, and many University professors—the same "liberal" combination to be found at work preaching subversion all over the Western world—have been attacking the White Australia policy for the last several years, but it is difficult to believe that Australians would really welcome competition for their jobs and homes from hordes of brown or yellow labourers.

Yet the Australian Labour Party must be assumed to have its ears close to the ground. Has it detected a change of public attitude towards this vital problem? The fact that Mr. Arthur Calwell, the party leader and throughout his life a champion of White Australia, has himself changed his mind would suggest something of the sort. On the other hand we must remember that it was the Labour Party which first demanded that Australia's new currency unit should be named the dollar. Perhaps its *volte face* over the White Australia policy is also an indication that it is very much aware of the desirability of securing the good-will of the dispensers of international financial patronage in New York.

* * *

It was a little startling to read in *The Times* an attack on Great Britain for abandoning her Empire written by an American professor of Georgetown University. Here is the letter:

"Sir—I have read for long and silently the criticisms in British newspapers of my country's presence

in Vietnam, but now I am provoked beyond patience. The ignominious and willy-nilly departure of Great Britain from the world scene following World War II may have satisfied the consciences of some supra-national liberals but it has dismayed many millions more. At a time when the Communist empire stretches across half the world and enslaves a third of the world's population, it is alarming to realize that the British Empire, almost equally large, has abandoned the field, leaving Americans to fight a dirty war.

"My people have always looked with admiration upon the British, especially their imperial creation, and now must try to re-establish order in the chaos of Britain's withdrawal from Africa and other areas. Independence has not been a notable success in such countries as Ghana and Cyprus, which at one time were governed by orders from London. Peace has not been preserved in India-Pakistan, following withdrawal. Dismemberment of the Empire has not provided a solution for today's evils, only material for more. Therefore as England retires into her cold, lonely, island shell (to quote the provincial press) I do not perceive much ground for criticisms of those fighting tooth and nail against the Communists, since this responsibility has apparently passed to the Americans. Is there no one in the House of Commons who is willing to seize a Union Jack and go out to retake the Empire?"

Yours faithfully,

C. Lewis Harden.

It would seem that Professor Harden is singularly uninformed about Anglo-American relations during the last several decades.

Does he not know that Roosevelt worked tirelessly for the destruction of the British and other European Empires, as did Truman and as did Eisenhower, who blackmailed the British and French Governments to withdraw their forces from Suez? We speak of American Presidents doing these things, but of course they were only puppets who helped to break down the European world-systems so that the United States could step in and enlarge the empire of international finance. The result has been chaos.

* * *

For one thing, the Americans have proved themselves incredibly brash and lacking in know-how. Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore put the matter concisely when he said that it was not the fault of the Americans if they were a young nation, "but by and large the Administration lacks the depth and judgment or wisdom which comes out of an accumulation of knowledge of human beings and human situations over a long period of time. That is lacking". He added "The British, however, possessed it".

The Americans, in many ways a great people, if given the time could conceivably acquire the flair for dealing with the men of other races. What inhibits the process is their thraldom to evil forces in New York which exhibit on a prodigious scale the mentality of the strong-arm man and the thug. As there is little likelihood of any immediate change, we can only continue to urge the need for Great Britain and other Western European nations to re-discover their own distinctive national stars that they may fling a barrier across the road down which the world is slithering with such speed to hell.

* * *

Why, within a few hours of paying his tribute to British wisdom (the traditional wisdom which is not much in evidence today) the Singapore Prime Minister found it necessary to say that if need be he would not hesitate to give Britain twenty-four hours' notice to vacate her bases in the island is still something of a mystery. One reason may be that he wished to rebut any suggestion that he was an Anglophile. Although Singapore is very largely dependent on Britain's goodwill, there, as among all the parvenu states which feed upon that goodwill, it is still unfashionable, and even politically dangerous, to be thought pro-British.

Such considerations should not blind us to the fact that Singapore is very much concerned lest Britain should be contemplating at least a partial withdrawal from her Far Eastern bases. Lee Kuan Yew may even have heard whispers of a possible deal to transfer some part of the British commitment to the Americans. Where Wall Street firms such as Kuhn Loeb start lending money, as has been done in Malaysia, it is not unusual for plans of this kind to be incubated. Harold Wilson, with balance of payments crises in mind, prostrates himself every time he thinks of the United States, so that he will certainly follow American directives. It may be enough for the world policy-makers, who play a highly ambiguous game, if Britain withdraws in whole or in part to create another power-vacuum for Communism eventually to fill.

* * *

Thirty-four English schoolboys were recently charged in a Guernsey court, where they admitted 34 offences of shoplifting. Twenty-three of the boys also admitted a further seventy such cases. Said the magistrate: "You are a disgusting lot of thieves. Every one of you is a mean little thief." The ages of the boys were between 12 and 15. One of the masters in charge of the holiday party (which came from Southern England) described the occurrence as a "mad escapade", but this was rejected by the magistrate, who pointed out that the offences were spread over ten days.

About the same time as this disgraceful affair the British Government published a White Paper in which the proposal was made to raise the age of criminal responsibility from ten to sixteen. Offenders under sixteen, if the proposal is adopted, will appear before family councils instead of courts of law, the idea being to take them "so far as possible outside the ambit of the criminal law and the courts". What other assumption can there be than that delinquents such as the schoolboys who engaged in an orgy of theft in Guernsey should be encouraged to think of their conduct in a non-criminal light? Our society, rotted by this kind of "liberal" thinking, has gone soft in the head.

* * *

It is also proposed that offenders in the 16-21 age group should likewise be treated in such a way that they will take a rosier view of their own criminal acts. The

aim, according to the White Paper, is "to divorce arrangements for trial and treatment so far as possible from the ordinary criminal courts and from the adult penal system". In both cases, declares the White Paper, "the determining factor in deciding what is to be done must be the welfare of the particular child or young person". I suppose, therefore, that in deciding what to do about—let us say—the thirty-four schoolboys who went from England on what turned out to be a thieving holiday in Guernsey, those entrusted with the job would be required first of all to determine what they considered best for each one of the thirty-four different young egos. A moment's thought should be enough to reveal the absurdity of such a procedure.

Why not carry the madness all the way by raising the age of criminal responsibility to twenty-one? When offenders under this age make war on society by ripping up railway compartments, or trying to derail trains, or running amock at seaside resorts, they might be requested to attend compensation tribunals, where Welfare State officials would assess the damage society had done, however obscurely, to their tender psyches and pay them accordingly either in cash or in purple hearts. If this idea be regarded as insane, let us consider how close to such insanity has modern social thinking advanced.

* * *

Mr. Maxwell Stamp, who headed the land commission sent by the British Government to Kenya, remarked in Nairobi that while the complete excision of Kenya's White farming backbone would be a fatal blow to the country's economy, he believed that further transfers of European farms to Africans were desirable. As the number of White farmers since independence has decreased by more than two-thirds, so that only about a thousand are left, it might seem that Mr. Stamp came very near to a contradiction in terms. His first proposition is self-evident. Why, then, the second? The Kenya Government is known to be anxious to persuade the British Government to finance its take-over of the remaining 2,000,000 acres of White land. Obviously Kenyatta and his Mau Mau associates want to have their cake and eat it. We must await the report of the Stamp Commission to see whether it encourages them to nourish these two incompatible desires.

I find Mr. Stamp and his companies in London something of an enigma. What precisely is their African expertise? What, to narrow the issue, is their policy towards South Africa? And what, if anything, do they do to further that policy?

* * *

I have asked before whether the Swaziland authorities are aware of the extent to which the territory is being used as a refuge and escape route for subversives fleeing from justice in South Africa.

Now I ask a more specific question. There is an anti-apartheid "hero" who conceived the pleasant idea of injecting disease into certain South African food exports, with a view to injuring the South African economy. He possesses the scientific know-how wherewith to carry out this diabolical idea, but thanks to the alertness of South Africa's Security service he found himself under suspicion and fled the country. The specific question is this: Are the Colonial Office officials aware that this dangerous creature is—or until recently was—a refugee in Swaziland? If they have no knowledge of the man their Intelligence needs shaking up.

* * *

While on the subject of Swaziland I have a question to ask its King. Tell me, Ngwenyama, why have you and your former Right-wing Administration swung so far to the Left?

If it is to become part of the tide, let me respectfully warn you that the more that tide is encouraged the more certain it is that it will sweep you and your chiefs into oblivion.

* * *

At a meeting in London about 75 immigrants considered a proposal to set up "a national organization of West Indian immigrants in Great Britain". To which nation the word "national" applies would seem to be a matter for conjecture—presumably it is this country. What is more, the West Indians are proposing to comport themselves with some vigour within the framework of our national life. Said the chairman: "Our aim is to show the British Government and British people that we are here to stay and that they must live with us". Now we know why the men of these islands protected their homeland through the centuries and why Britannia so long ruled the waves. The whole of our history, it might seem, had no purpose other than to usher in the day when strangers from afar would be able to claim the usufruct of our country as their absolute right.

It is bad enough that successive British Governments should have allowed a colour problem to be created in the British Isles. When the immigrants assume the attitude of conquerors and proclaim to both Government and people that their occupation must be considered permanent it becomes intolerable.

* * *

In our July issue we recorded that the Earl of Arran had described as a Fascist a woman reader who reproached him for his sponsorship of the move to legalize homosexual practices among consenting adults. The reader sent him a courteous and reasoned reply, which brought forth this response from the Nobleman: "Thank you for your letter of the 24th June. I apologise for not having answered it before: I apologise for nothing else. My suggestion to you is that you get out and do some good instead of carping at others. About your condemnation of your fellow human beings, 'Judge not that ye be not judged'. Don't write to me again."

His Lordship evidently mistakes sheer bad manners for the language of aristocracy. Is there anybody on Associated Newspapers these days who deplores the use of its notepaper for such an exhibition?

* * *

I thought there was something quite exquisite in the statement of Kenneth Kaunda that the South African Government proposed to spend £5,000 on creating dis-

turbances in Zambia with the object of showing that African states are unfit to rule themselves. It had not occurred to me, and it still does not occur to me, that Pretoria is so little realistic that it is prepared to paint the lily and gild refined gold. In this tough world it is not usual for large sums of money to be paid out for the purpose of demonstrating the self-evident.

The next thing that Kaunda will be telling us is that Alice Lenshina, many of whose followers were tortured and put to death by his murder-squads, had been secretly indoctrinated by Dr. Verwoerd.

* * *

Zambia's most gorgeously named Minister of Space Research, Edward Nkoloso, planned to land a space-woman on the moon this year, but he has suffered a setback. His project, presented in all seriousness, was to launch her in a space-craft, made out of soldered dustbins, by means of a bent-back sapling. Now, sadly, the great event has been postponed. What has gone wrong? Lots of things. Firstly, the £750,000,000 which he requested from U.N.E.S.C.O. to finance the scheme was not forthcoming, not a penny of it. Secondly, his 10-man team of astronauts went on strike, demanding to be paid for being rolled down hill in oil drums as a practice for moon-landings and being swung from trees to experience weightlessness. Two of them, he complains, went on a beer-drink three months ago and have not been seen since. Another has joined a song and dance club. And so on, repeating the tale of the ten little nigger-boys.

What of the woman astronaut? She stayed the course, being rolled down a hill in an oil drum no less than fifty times. Then her thoughts returned from the moon to old mother earth and she is now in what our grandfathers would delicately have called "an interesting condition". Poor Nkoloso thus finds that the course of true science never did run smooth. But he is not dismayed and has invited the Americans to participate in his project on condition that he is the first man out of the space-craft to plant Zambia's flag on the moon. Fitting though that would be, there is no room in this world for poetic justice and the odds against the fulfilment of Nkoloso's ambition must be sought in infinity. Alas!

* * *

After banning a British aircraft from making an emergency landing on Britain's Ascension Island, the United States Government has been graciously pleased to allow the Fairey Air Survey Company to fly a Dakota by way of Ascension to carry out a survey in Ecuador for the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation.

Such a signal service to the cause of freedom should earn for President Johnson an honoured memorial at Runnymede.

A.K.C.

# OPEN LETTER TO DR. RAMSEY

YOUR Grace,

I sometimes wonder what thoughts now go through the heads of those left-wing (for want of a better term) Churchmen who complained so bitterly when you were translated from the pleasant See of Durham to succeed the late and well-beloved Dr. Cyril Garbett as Archbishop of York. You it was then, you remember, who was the "bloody reactionary", because you showed signs not only that you thought that Christianity and anarchy were two different things, but even that you thought that they were two opposed things. Perhaps the multitudinous duties of the archbishoprics first of York and then of Canterbury are so overwhelming that they have occupied your full attention, and prevented you from realising the full extent to which you have saved yourself from the taint of this modern heresy. Be that as it may, you must surely have noticed that you have long ceased to be the target for the recriminations of those curious people who welcomed as a milestone on the road to "progress" and "enlightenment" the achievement of Satan in getting himself removed from the Catechism of the Church of England.

A short time after you had become Archbishop of York, I was told of an occasion at which you had taken the chair at a Church meeting in a Yorkshire cinema, among the advertised "attractions" at which was that turbulent priest Father Trevor Huddleston (now Bishop of Masasi), whom I once heard give vent to his Christian feelings by declaring that if he were an African and had a knife he would certainly stick the knife into the nearest White man. Father Huddleston at that time had gained considerable notoriety (he would probably have preferred the word "acclaim") through, among other aberrations, his eagerness to misrepresent as "oppression of the poor natives" the efforts of the South African authorities to replace the festering sore of Sophiatown by the relatively spacious comforts of Meadowlands. My informants told me with something approaching unholy glee of how this publicity-conscious prelate (as he now is) had made his prima-donna-like entrance some minutes (if not hours) after the meeting had begun, of how the audience had begun to give him the sort of welcome normally reserved for the modern idea of what an M.B.E. should be, and of how one glance from you had quelled not only the welcome but also its object.

Encouraged by these signs of sanity (if I may coin a word which the extreme Left has quite incongruously attempted to make its own), I wrote to Your Grace drawing your attention to the somewhat questionable causes to which the Rev. Canon John Collins, Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral, gives the cachet of his office. You replied, quite rightly, that St. Paul's Cathedral did not fall within your Province, and that therefore there was little you could do about the Canon. Your letter was tinged with regret, and it was probably for this reason that I did not notice how much more it was the letter of a politician than of a man of God. It is some years, Your Grace, since St. Paul's Cathedral did fall within your Province, and yet I have waited in vain for some sign that you have done anything to curb the worst exuberances of Canon Collins. Indeed, I begin to feel that you encourage them.

"Cassandra" of the *Daily Mirror* described Your Grace not very long ago as the epitome of "the Church Militant" because of speeches made in the House of Lords against regarding the Sin of Sodom as a crime and against inflicting the (humanly) supreme penalty of execution upon those who murder their fellow men. I hope that I am not lacking in compassion, but I do not believe—and I do not believe that Christians should believe—that because one may feel sorry for one particular sodomite or one particular murderer one should expand the feeling into one of sympathy with all sodomites or all murderers. The late King George V had one most admirable maxim: "Teach me to distinguish betwen sentiment and sentimentality, admiring the one and despising the other." And while "Cassandra" was praising you as the personification of "the Church Militant", I was merely regretting your failure to make that vital distinction.

I was regretting the failure, but I was no longer surprised by it. My capacity for surprise had been o'erreached by your notes in the *Canterbury Diocesan Letter* last year after the trial of the South African terrorist Nelson Mandela. Here was a man who had freely confessed—boasted would perhaps be a better word—to the use of terrorism for the furtherance of his political objectives. Here was a man, moreover, whose political objectives were avowedly those of the avowedly atheistic Communist conspiracy. Yet when this self-confessed terrorist in an avowedly anti-Christian cause was placed on trial by a Christian authority, given all means of defence which a civilised nation permits to even the most self-evidently, and indeed self-avowedly, guiltily depraved, found guilty and imprisoned for life Your Grace of Canterbury chose as the target for your wrath and scorn not the terrorist but those who had freed society from his menace. When I and my friends read reports of this in the Press we wrote to you to protest, and in reply your secretary most disingenuously expressed the hope that we had read your actual *Diocesan Notes*, and not merely Press reports of them. I use the word "disingenuously" because I *had* committed the misdemeanour of drafting a letter to you on the basis of what I had read in the Press of what you had written, and it *had* occurred to me that I might be uncharitable in doing so, so that I *had* taken the trouble of ringing up Church House and going there to collect a copy of what you had actually written, only to find that for once the Press reports had been only too damnably accurate, so that I did not need to alter my draft in the slightest.

And so, Your Grace, you must not be surprised if some of us fail to share the enthusiasm which "Cassandra" feels for you as the personification of "the Church Militant". Perhaps I should mention that this Open Letter came to be written as a result of a conversation I had not very long ago with a friend—a man so devout that he no longer feels able to attend the services of the Church over which you preside as Primate of All England, and of which for many decades he was humbly proud to be a member—in which I attempted to defend you and some of your fellow-prelates against his strictures and found that I could do so with no conviction. The lack of conviction was perhaps the result of the grotesque idea that condonation of sodomy and murder could be regarded as the mark of "the Church Militant". It was also, I think, because of the failure of you and your fellow-prelates to realise that the one time when the Founder of the Church showed Himself to be truly militant was when he drove the money-changers out of the Temple.

Your Grace, you would earn no plaudits from the lackeys (an overworked word, but find me a better!) of the bleeding-heart millionaire Press were you to drop your special pleading for sodomites and murderers and issue a blast against those most damnable of all sinners, the usurers. But you would regain, for what it may be worth, the respect once felt for you by

Yours sincerely,

AUSTEN BROOKS.

# "THIS BOOK IS DANGEROUS"

"WHAT a masterly analysis." So wrote the staunch Loyalist Elizabeth, Lady Freeman to A. K. Chesterton after reading his new book *The New Unhappy Lords*. "I am amazed," she added, "at your facility for condensation, though I can't help wishing that you had been able to be a little more expansive and had been able to include a few more dates. . . . . It was kind of you to write that inscription and to send me this copy, which I shall treasure in memory of the bravest man I know."

"Your book is terrific," wrote Air Commodore G. S. Oddie, D.F.C., A.F.C., "and the setting out in sequence of the steps one by one by which our downfall was achieved is particularly useful, as one tends to forget them also one by one. I shall try my best to make it known."

"A consummate epitome of the major world events of the last half-century and an expert analysis of their causes, or probable causes," was the description of the book by Mr. D. S. Fraser Harris, chairman of the League of Empire Loyalists. "Only the most obtuse reader could fail to have his mental processes stimulated. The book, from beginning to end, is a brilliant piece of writing, and undoubtedly is, whether or not it will ever be openly acknowledged as such, the most valuable contribution to political thought in this country in recent years."

A tribute from a fellow author was this message from Mark Ewell, author of *Manacles for Mankind*, who wrote: "It is difficult to find words to express our joy and feelings of triumphant hope upon receipt of *The New Unhappy Lords*. You have made 1965 a year of profound significance for the cause of the Counter-Revolution and given us all what will long remain the classic indictment of the International Financiers. The cumulative effect of the case you build up so ably and so resonantly, chapter after chapter, is the most devastating possible."

"Your book is terrific," wrote Mr. Hilaire du Berrier, noted international (though not internationalist) political commentator whose headquarters are in Paris.

*"The New Unhappy Lords* is badly needed, and your treatment of them is excellent."

"I have just read the book and wish I hadn't so that I could start all over again," wrote Mrs. I. Atherley. "It is marvellous ... It has a kind of cumulative effect when put together and written in such a masterful, quiet and obviously sincere manner. When I get home I will try and get the Public Library to buy some copies."

Mr. Harold McCrone, of Laxton, was struck by "the miracle of condensation; the scope and sweep of the movement—all harmonised to render comprehensible to the average mind such a vast affair, is much more than a *tour de force*. I wonder what other man, if any, could have reduced to such simple terms so complex and involved a movement as that which threatens our civilisation: yet you bring it into compass and order and conviction so that the most ordinary minds can absorb and grasp its message."

Another of the many tributes received from readers at home came from Dr. F. Endean, of Woolhampton, Berks. *"The New Unhappy Lords,"* he wrote, "is a masterpiece and makes magnetic reading. My hope is that it will enter the skulls of the general nit-wit public, from the top-heavy intellectuals down, I will do all I can to advertise it."

### OVERSEAS TRIBUTES

Tributes have also come from readers overseas. For example, a South-African-born reader now living in Canada wrote to A.K.C.: "My sincere congratulations on your excellent interpretation of world affairs, and the masterly manner in which you are conducting your extremely important and difficult job, particularly at this crucial period", while an American writes: "A.K.C. is without doubt the outstanding commentator and analyst on world events. . . . No man has linked more clearly, more analytically, the relation between Money Power and Red Non-Government and tyranny."

### "This Book is Dangerous"—*City Press.*

Mrs. Atherley's intention of asking her local library to order copies of the book is one which has already been put into effect by other readers, and should be followed by all those who wish to help to secure the widest possible readership for this vitally important book. Another way in which supporters can help to secure the maximum readership for the book is by placing the small leaflets advertising it in the hands of people likely to be interested. These could also be used as bookmarks in books from the serious shelves of libraries, while readers may care to take them along to booksellers in their home towns and suggest that they buy copies of *The New Unhappy Lords.* They could tell booksellers that we are prepared to allow the special discounts on orders of three or more and 10 or more over and above the normal trade discount, but that we cannot supply books on sale or return.

There is, of course, one way in which those who can afford to can be sure of helping to secure a wide readership for the book, and that is by buying extra copies of it and giving them to friends. A number have already done this. Readers will no doubt have other ideas of their own. We should be glad to have them.

## CHESTERTON VERSUS BANK OF CHILE

MR. A. K. Chesterton has issued a writ against the Bank of Chile. In Chilean terms it is a petition for judgment for compensation for damages against the Bank.

The case, although complicated in detail, may be simply stated. The late R. K. Jeffery, who lived in Chile, left Chesterton his fortune for the use of the Candour movement. His bequest was in the form of a sealed will which he placed for safekeeping with the Bank's Department of Confidential Commissions. After his death, Chilean law required the sealed envelope to be delivered for opening to a court of justice, which alone was empowered to receive the document.

Instead, the law was flagrantly broken. On the authority of Senor Felipe Aguirre, a lawyer of the Bank who became aware that enquiries about the will were being made on behalf of the British Consul-General, the Bank handed the sealed will, not to a court of law, but to a woman who claimed to be the heir on the strength (if that be the word) of an open will drawn up a few hours before Mr. Jeffery's death, when the testator was desperately ill and drugged to alleviate the pain. His thumb was pressed to the document. The woman's husband promptly "lost" the sealed will on a bus.

As a result of the Bank's action, which has not been denied, Chesterton was left without means of making good his claim and the present action is for full compensation for his loss.

Although the litigation now started may appear a David versus Goliath affair, it should be remembered that David won. In his fight against the leviathan represented by the Bank of Chile, Chesterton has already had the financial backing of good friends and it is expected that all sympathisers will wish to give him their practical support now that they know that a writ has been isued.

---

## HOME TRUTHS FOR WILSON

WHEN Harold Wilson was in Cornwall last month he was the recipient of a few home truths from Phil Burbidge, who told him before he could escape to the Scilly Isles that the Government's deference to the clamour of Left Wing M.P.s for heavy reductions in defence expenditure and the pending scuttle from Aden were shameful.

Burbidge denounced the Labour Party's advocacy of World Government in its election manifesto. This would mean a despotic, Godless order, he declared, such as the late George Orwell portrayed in his book *1984,* a Communist-run slave-camp with no room for Christian values.

Some of the assembled onlookers applauded Burbidge's closing reference to Rhodesia. Reminding Wilson that the Rhodesian Prime Minister had declared that only over his dead body would the Union Jack be hauled down, Burbidge added: "Empire Loyalists hope and pray that Mr. Ian Smith will not capitulate to our spineless crowd of politicians."

Printed by the Berence Press Ltd., 97 Cobbold Road, London, N.W.10, and Published by the Candour Publishing Co., 11 Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, London, S.W.1